

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the present amendment and following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-7 are currently pending in the present application; Claim 5 is canceled by the present amendment; and Claims 1-4 and 6-7 are amended. Support for the amendments is found at least in the originally filed specification at page 6, paragraph [0014] and Figures 10 and 11. Thus, no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Emanuel et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0012328, hereafter "Emanuel").

In response to the rejection of Claims 1-7, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for the following reasons. Pending Claim 1 recites, "wherein said corresponding means corresponds one of said radio access channels and said transmission/reception ports to the other, based on an allocation priority of each of said radio access channels and each of said transmission/reception ports." The outstanding Office Action at page 3 asserts that paragraph [50] of Emanuel describes the "allocation priority" feature of pending Claim 1. However, paragraph [0050] of Emanuel describes Emanuel's **addressing** scheme.¹ Paragraph [0050] of Emanuel does **not** describe an **allocation priority** feature. Rather, paragraph [0051] of Emanuel describes a priority scheme where different level of priority is assigned to the radio part specific message.² Segmenting radio messages according to a priority level of the radio part specific message,³ as described in Emanuel does not base the correspondence of a radio access channel and a transmission/reception port to each other, based on allocation priority of "each of said radio access channels **and** each of said transmission/reception ports," as recited in pending Claim 1.

¹ Emanuel, par. [0050].

² Emanuel, par. [0051].

³ Emanuel, par. [0051].

Accordingly, Emanuel does not teach every element of pending Claim 1. Independent Claims 6 and 7 include similar features. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claims 1-4, 6, and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Emanuel be withdrawn.

Consequently, in view of the foregoing discussion and present amendment, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. An early and favorable action is therefore respectfully requested.


Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 03/06)



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

BDL:MS\la

I:\ATTY\MS\PROSECUTION\24S\245422US\245422US-AMEND DUE 07 13 2006.DOC

Scott A. McKeown
Registration No. 42,866